DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 475 947 IR 021 945

AUTHOR	Price, Betsy; Cates, Ward M.; Bodzin, Alex
TITLE	Challenges in Implementing Technology-Rich Curricular High School Biology Materials: First Year Findings from the "Exploring Life" Project.
PUB DATE	2002-06-00
NOTE	18p.; In: NECC 2002: National Educational Computing Conference Proceedings (23rd, San Antonio, Texas, June 17-19, 2002); see IR 021 916.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://confreg.uoregon.edu/necc2002/ .
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Biology; *Computer Assisted Instruction; *Computer Uses in Education; Curriculum Development; *Educational Technology; High Schools; Internet; Learning Activities; Science Education; Secondary Education; *Technology Integration; World Wide Web

ABSTRACT

Eighteen high school biology teachers from a stratified sample of 13 distinct geographical United States regions participated in evaluation of the first year prototypes of Exploring Life, a biology program that includes a textbook with an accompanying Internet component and wet-lab investigations. Web activities explain and reinforce the text and promote active, hands-on learning. The major questions the study addressed were: How ready are biology teachers who are early adopters of technology to employ a curriculum that requires students to use computers on a regular or even daily basis? What motivation, additional education, hardware, or skills do teachers require in order to integrate almost daily computer use into the curriculum? Do high schools have the adequate technology facilities to implement a curricular program that incorporates students using computers on an almost daily basis? How might existing schools change to support a technology-based curricular program? (Contains 26 references.) (Author)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 475 947

CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTING TECHNOLOGY-RICH CURRICULAR HIGH SCHOOL BIOLOGY MATERIALS: FIRST YEAR FINDINGS FROM THE *EXPLORING LIFE* PROJECT

Betsy Price, Director of the Associate Instructor Program
Westminster College, Salt Lake City, UT 84105
bprice@westminstercollege.edu

Ward M. Cates, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA
Alex Bodzin, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P.S. Calegari

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Eighteen high school biology teachers from a stratified sample of thirteen distinct geographical United States regions participated in evaluation of the first year prototypes of Exploring Life, a biology program that includes a textbook with an accompanying Internet component and wet-lab investigations. Web activities explain and reinforce the text and promote active, hands-on learning.

The major questions we sought to answer through our study were,

- How ready are biology teachers who are early adopters of technology to employ a curriculum that requires students to use computers on a regular or even daily basis?
- What motivation, additional education, hardware, or skills do teachers require in order to integrate almost daily computer use into the curriculum?
- Do high schools have the adequate technology facilities to implement a curricular program that incorporates students using computers on an almost daily basis?
- How might existing schools change to support a technology-based curricular program?

Key words: Technology integration, technology readiness, Internet curriculum, general biology, facilities for technology, teaching skills, educational technology, inquiry, computer uses in education

Introduction

In typical technology champion style, early adopters prophesied a few years back that the best was yet to come for teaching and learning using technology (Jacobsen, 1998;

IR021945

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Copyright 2002, Authors

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

Norman, 1997). Unfortunately, the extent to which technology has effected radical change in teaching and learning falls a bit short of the prophecy.

Data from the Digest of Educational Statistics (1998) and the *State-of-the-States survey* (Technical Horizons in Education, 2001) suggests that many schools have advanced beyond the first level of adopting technology: purchasing hardware and software, preparing school facilities, and wiring schools for Internet access. Many schools have also completed the second level of adoption: preparing teachers to operate computers. As a rule, successful completion of the first and second levels makes record keeping easier, improves the quality of presentations, and increases professional communication among teachers.

Despite the apparent readiness of school systems to advance to the next level of technology integration and the presence of better computer facilities than a few years ago technology-rich curricular materials do not appear to have yet been implemented on a large scale. According to the *State-of-the-States survey* (Technological Horizons in Education, 2001), 90% of the responding state-level directors of technology reported that they either require or recommend the integration of computers into the curriculum. However, state directors of technology also reported that they would rate only 80% of their state's teachers as "average" in proficiency in integrating technology. Further, these state directors suggested that only 62% of their teachers used technology to enhance teaching, while fewer than 45% pursued higher level thinking activities with their students. Similarly, the directors rated only 11% of their teachers as above average in using project based learning or cooperative groups.

The Milken Foundation funded a study to identify and list the factors that determine whether schools will be successful in bringing up the level of student use of computers for learning (Lemke & Coughlin, 1998). Missing from their list of keys to success, however, was a well-developed, comprehensive curriculum that can be used for an entire course of study. Such year-long curricula that integrate technology may be crucial to helping teachers bring about the kind of systemic change that technology integration may demand (CEO Forum, 1997; Mann, 1998; Sherman, 1998). There appears to be much support for the desire for such curricula (Bailey, 1997; Dockstader, 1999; Ediger, 1997; Fine 1999; Gunter &Wiens, 1998; Hall & Mantz, 2000). This

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

support is further reinforced by the fact that 22% of the state-level directors of technology who, when asked why computers are not used in schools, responded that schools needed to revise curriculum.

To address just this need, the present project integrates technology into the full-year curriculum. The product uses a 4 E's learning cycle model, a modification of the 5 E's instructional model (Bybee, 1993) that integrates computer media throughout. The "E's" represent various phases of the constructivist learning cycle (Engage, Explore, Explain, Evaluate). The product, whose prototyping was funded by the National Science Foundation, integrates a shorter (800 page), concept-oriented textbook, a collection of inquiry-based lab and field activities, and an extensive World Wide Web site that provides an interactive learning environment for students. These components are designed to work together to help teachers provide a more interactive classroom in which computers support and enhance delivery of the curriculum. Unlike textbooks "published" (posted) on the Web largely as Acrobat PDF files or other forms of documents and worksheets, *Exploring Life* materials go beyond simple reading, teacher lesson plans, and activity worksheets. Web activities explain and reinforce the text and promote active, hands-on learning. They encourage students to explore, analyze, draw conclusions, and share their findings.

Hoover and Abhava (1995) argued, however, that many "educational" sites are not well suited to classroom use because they lacked strong instructional (pedagogical) design and scientists (content specialists) have difficulty collaborating with educators and website designers to produce the most efficacious sites. In addition, a number of authors argue that teachers need professional development to help them learn how to integrate technology into teaching and learning and we need newer models for such development activities (see for example. Black,1998; Smith-Gratto & Fisher,1999).

Clearly, we needed to explore how this innovative approach to melding a print textbook with online activities influenced what teachers in real school settings might do. The developers produced prototype materials and then asked a sample of teachers to implement them in real classrooms under a wide range of technology availabilities. The major questions we, the evaluators, sought to answer through our study were,

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

- How ready are biology teachers who are early adopters of technology to employ a curriculum that requires students to use computers on a regular or even daily basis?
- What motivation, additional education, hardware, or skills do teachers require in order to integrate almost daily computer use into the curriculum?
- Do high schools have the adequate technology facilities to implement a curricular program that incorporates students using computers on an almost daily basis?
- How might existing schools change to support a technology-based curricular program?

Participants

Three evaluation workshops were conducted at different developmental stages during the first year of our project. To attract participants, we posted calls for participation on national and state educational listservs and bulletin boards. Biology teachers who were interested in participating in the *Biology: Exploring Life* evaluation completed a 44-item computer experience questionnaire. This questionnaire allowed us to identify participants' varied demographics and background characteristics, including: geographical area, socio-economic level of the school, years using the Internet for teacher planning/preparation, perceived preparation to use the computer and Internet in classroom activities, training to integrate instructional technologies into curricula, number of computers in the classroom and school, student-to-computer ratio, and extent of technology use in the classroom.

Forty-two high school biology teachers, one preservice biology teacher, and one science supervisor, were selected from a stratified sample of thirteen distinct geographical regions that included Alaska and Hawaii. These 44 people participated in evaluation of the first year prototypes, reviewing the materials in various stages of development at one of the three evaluation workshops (August 2000, October 2000, and March 2001). Although the 42 teachers had volunteered to implement the materials in their classrooms, only 18 were able to do so during the 2000-2001 school year. They pilot-tested the *Biology: Exploring Life* materials with 783 students. The loss of 24 teachers was due primarily to scheduling problems and the timing of the workshops in relation to when the content in the prototypes was covered in their classrooms. For this reason, some of these teachers agreed to participate in the year 2 field test instead. In

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

addition, five classrooms were chosen for field observations based on arbitrary volunteer selection.

Data Collection

As noted earlier, we collected demographic data on teachers' past practices, teaching experience, use of computers, and professional development. At the three workshops, teacher participants evaluated how well prototype materials met national and local teaching standards, and the cognitive and interest level of students. In addition, they assessed the quality of prototype use of the interactive qualities of computers and the Internet. To assess the use of the materials in the classroom, the evaluation team conducted five classroom field observations during the school year. Students completed measures of biology content knowledge and concepts before and after using chapter materials, and each teacher submitted a questionnaire and a journal with open-ended responses after using each chapter. To collect a richer and more detailed set of teacher impressions, a member of the evaluation team conducted follow-up phone interviews with teacher participants who completed two or more units and were selected. To obtain a richer pool of student reactions to the prototypes, we selected two volunteer teachers and their students submitted journals.

Findings

Findings are discussed below in terms of the teachers' self-report data prior to implementing the materials in the school setting and then what we learned about their actual use of the materials in the pilot. Although student knowledge of biology, as measured by all four pre-to-post pilot measures, increased significantly [$t(477)=18.64$; $t(212)=15.11$; $t(85)=9.94$; $t(77)=4.79$; all findings $p=.001$] and student reported strong favorable reactions to the prototype materials, this paper focuses on the teacher's experience. Thus, we discuss student findings only in relation to how they might affect teacher actions and decisions in implementing such a technology-rich product.

Participant Self-Report Data Before the Pilot

This section is divided into four main parts: *participants as early adopters, reduced planning time, computer facilities and support,* and *participant use of technology.*

Participants as Early Adopters

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

According to Rogers (1986), adopters of technology fall into fairly clearly defined categories. Innovators and early adopters lead the way, early majority hold the middle ground, while late majority adopters and laggards wait longest. Given that we used the Web and email as principal means of soliciting a volunteer sample, we assumed our participants might well fall on the leading edge of Rogers' adoption-of-innovation curve (as applied to educational technology use). The demographic data offered some support for this assumption.

Our teachers reported that they used computers for preparation and planning once a week or more (97%) and rated themselves as well or very well prepared to use technology (83%). The vast majority of our participating teachers (88.1%) reported they had used computers for three or more years in teacher planning and preparation and had attended professional development experiences in the past three years related to technology use or implementation. Similarly all participants (100%) reported that they had assigned their students Internet research tasks, while 92.9% reported they had assigned students data-analysis and problem-solving tasks using computers or the Internet reported. Those same respondents reported that they felt ready to use computers for their own professional use, as well as with their students. Participants reported notable levels of reported participation in professional development activities; 76.2% said they had completed nine or more hours in the past 3 years, while one-third reported taking more than 32 hours in that same period. Despite such training, most in our sample identified their own independent learning (97.6%) and interactions among colleagues (83.3%) as main sources of their knowledge about technology and its use. This contrasts with 35.7% who reported that at least a moderate extent of their training came from college courses.

Reduced Planning Time

Participants noted on their questionnaires during the first workshop that additional planning time would be needed to infuse technology into their biology curriculum. This is consistent with other educators (Cummings, 1998; Heck &Wallace, 1999; Schnackenberg, Asuncion, & Rosler, 1999) suggesting technology implementations increase the demand on teacher planning time and restrictions in available time may act as a limiting factor.

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

However, during focus groups prior to the field test, the teachers espoused the belief-that the prototype materials would actually save planning time. Because these materials included interactive activities that enhanced the text, offered links that were kept up to date, and the publishers were responsible for keeping information updated, participants opined that they would spend less time searching and more time teaching. Because the program offered activities at various cognitive levels, participants also thought the prototype materials might save time adjusting materials for different class levels and interests.

Computer Facilities and Support

Many teachers in our study (73.8%) reported adequate to that their administrators would be supportive of an integrative curriculum. Most (54.8%) rated the number of computers in their school as sufficient to use a Web-based curriculum. Similarly, most respondents (61%) reported that their districts had a computer training requirement.

Participating teachers reported differential access to computers in their instructional settings. Twenty five percent of the participants had what we would call a classroom set, 10 or more computers in their room. Forty nine percent of the teachers had two to nine computers and only 26% had just one computer in their room. Almost all of the teachers (97.6%) reported, however, they also had access to a computer lab.

Participant Use of Technology

At the same time that we saw evidence that our sample might be more active in using technology in schools, we were surprised at the ways teachers reported actually using computers in schools. The three most reported activities --searching for possible activities to use with students, communicating with colleagues, and word processing-- were uses supporting teaching, not uses involving students in the classroom directly. When we looked at how students in their classrooms used computers, most of the reported activities were data collection and reporting.

A majority of the teachers (66.7%) responded that they did not use computers for multimedia presentations at all, or did so infrequently. This finding seems consonant with McDermott and Murray (2000) who contended that the use of computers still remains teacher-centered as opposed to learner-centered. The finding seems particularly

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

important here, however, because our prototype materials are student-centered and require teachers to have students use computers in the classroom almost daily.

Pilot Results

This section is organized around four headings. The first three parallel the discussions form above: *planning time not reduced, inconsistent computer facilities issues,* and *teacher use of technology*. The fourth heading, *findings related to specific learners,* addresses how specific populations of students interacted with the prototypes.

Planning Time Not Reduced

Despite teachers' prediction of reduced planning time requirements, once the field test was underway, the majority of teachers reported that they spent additional time planning and preparing to teach. Most of that extra time was spent dealing with the technical requirements: arranging computers, adjusting schedules around labs times, and installing software and Web browser plug-ins. Many teachers reported spending planning time developing supplemental worksheets to be used as an accountability measure as students completed the online tutorials. As anticipated, teachers did feel that the program reduced the amount of time they spent searching for support materials and respondents suggested that they would be able to spend less time planning if their school computers were properly configured and the publisher developed worksheets to be used with materials.

Inconsistent Computer Facilities and Support

Once using the prototype materials on a regular basis, our teachers discovered their school buildings often-did not have an adequate technology support system for implementing such technology-intensive curricular materials. As we talked to teachers, we found that there was little consistency about how schools student computer facilities. Some spread out one or two computers so that every room had a computer; some schools placed all the student use computers in computer labs.

Many of the teachers had planned to use their school's computer lab to do the activities. However, teachers often discovered they were not able to access their computer lab or the availability was very restricted with little scheduling flexibility. Sometimes this meant our teachers were left having to adjust a week or even a month of lessons in order to get lab time. Or such availability might determine whether the

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

materials got used at all: One teacher was called out of town and her class missed the computer lab day. When she returned, she was unable to reserve another day right away. Unfortunately, she had used up the time that was allotted to the concept by her core curriculum and had to move on to other materials.

Most biology classrooms were not designed to accommodate a large number of computers. Often there are not enough electrical outlets and few (or no) Internet connections. Some schools lined computers up in neat rows but that left little room for students to work in pairs or even work independently because the quarters were so close. Our observations indicated that wireless computers offered greater flexibility in classroom arrangements than using a computer lab, permitting more collaboration and small group work. However, even with wireless computers, difficulties occurred. In one classroom, students had to walk around the room, holding their computers like divining rods to find the service area of their wireless computer hub. Their room was, by the pernicious nature of the technology gods, located in an area that received three separate signals from opposite ends of the school.

Facilities were only part of the problem, however. Most reported difficulties related to preparing computers to use the program. The computers required a minimum system requirements of 64 MB of RAM, Internet Explorer 5 or higher as the Web browser, 350 MHz CPU speed, at least 56K connection speed, and installation of Flash 5 and QuickTime 4 plug-ins on the Web-browser. Every school had a unique network system configuration, requiring knowledge of how the network addresses needed to be configured for network access. Most teachers required computer support persons to help them confirm their computers met the minimum requirements and were configured properly. This included help downloading and installing the Web browser and the necessary plug-ins. When adequate technical support was not available, teachers needed to be "technologically savvy" in order to prepare available computers to implement the curriculum.

Communication between teacher and computer support persons varied greatly from school to school, as did responsiveness. Some teachers were able to call system administrators who quickly came to configure computers, while others had system administrators who responded slowly or didn't show at all. One teacher had computers in

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

her room for six months before they sent a technician in to set them up and to connect them to the Internet. The knowledge level of the system support people in different schools also varied greatly. In one case, a teacher checked with the system administrator and was assured that the school's computers would be able to run the program. When she began the pilot test, she found that the computers were woefully inadequate.

School system technology policies also proved a barrier in some case. Some systems had blocking software that inhibited learners from accessing externally linked Websites that were linked to prototype activities. Some systems restricted teachers from downloading necessary plug-ins or upgrading their version of Internet Explorer. Two teachers had problems with their systems not connecting to the Website. Because of low memory computers, one teacher had to download the plug-ins in the morning and then take them off at night. Often, school Internet connections was slow, frustrating students and teachers.

Regardless of how much technical support teachers had in their school, all teachers became emergency technicians while pilot testing the prototype materials, troubleshooting problems as necessary during class. Many teachers had to learn to download software, reboot computers, and install audio capabilities on their computers. The amount of time and type of problem was usually a minor annoyance. However, sometimes it constituted enough of a hardship for the teacher that the pilot testing was aborted (18 teachers out of the 42).

Teacher Use of Technology

As we observed teachers in the classroom, it was apparent that being an innovator was not always fun or easy. Few of the teachers had the perfect assemblage and availability of computers. Many teachers had difficulties thinking about ways in which they could adapt use of computers to facilitate their teaching. As previously mentioned, most of the teachers had not used computers with the students on a regular basis or as a critical component for teaching. In order to implement the prototype materials, many teachers had to adjust their normal styles of teaching.

There was no one pattern to how the teachers used the prototype materials. Teachers spent from two to 20 days implementing the chapters. How and what materials teachers used appeared influenced by their comfort level in working with technology, as

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

well as their need to meet local standards and core curriculum requirements. Teachers also selected different components based on the ability level of their students and the sorts of instructional activities best supported by the arrangement and location of available computers.

It appears that many biology teachers in our sample did not know how to make the most of available computers in their classrooms. Of those teachers who had multiple computers in their classrooms, few reported using them as learning stations. Likewise, few teachers said they used an LCD projector to project visualizations on a screen or a television monitor to call attention to biological concepts presented in the materials. One teacher, who did not know she had the ability to connect her computer to her classroom television monitor, decided to print out an animation screen to illustrate the biological concepts that were presented in the animation. Another teacher, despite having enough computers in her classroom for the students to work in groups, took her students to the library computer lab to do the activities, since she believed the only way to work with prototype materials was individually (one computer per student). Similarly, many teachers were unaware of new products just coming out, like wireless computers, hand-held computers, and SmartBoards that would offer more ways to present interactive segments of the prototype materials.

Many teachers customized the instructional design of the materials to accommodate their pedagogical styles. The materials are designed in such a way that teachers can selectively choose different components to meet the diverse needs of their students. For example, one teacher chose to use the Web components to enhance her lecture material. In contrast, after implementing the wet lab, another teacher had students use the computer activities to check their understanding of concepts presented in the lab and reinforce that learning.

Most teachers did not implement all computer-based activities in a chapter. When teachers had limited time, wet labs were the first activities to be omitted and teachers tended to use the Webquests at the beginning of the chapters as an introduction to the chapter's content. Interactive tutorials were next most likely to be used by teachers to illustrate concepts or to reinforce vocabulary.

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

Teachers experienced management issues when using the prototype materials in a computer lab. In computer labs, eye contact was a problem with students seated behind computer monitor or with their backs to the teacher. Computer audio could also be a problem: As an extreme example, the students in one lab were completing an activity in which a bear burps after he has eaten an apple. They decided to devote time to trying to get all computers to play the bear's burp in unison and the teacher had trouble getting them back on task.

Teachers who were accustomed to using teacher-centered approach found it difficult to be the center of activity in a computer lab. One teacher commented that she felt a bit useless and didn't quite know what to do when the students became focused on the computers and busy with the activities. Student data suggested that teachers were not the only ones aware of the change: Several students noted in their journals that their learning became more intrinsic and relied less on the teacher's direct instruction. Many students said they enjoyed the shift in emphasis to a more student-centered atmosphere. However, not all students preferred learning autonomously with computers. In two schools, higher level biology students reported that they preferred a more traditional textbook-centered curriculum to the prototype materials.

We deemed a successful implementation of the prototype materials to be one in which classroom students were able to use the prototype materials that were assigned by the teacher. A variety of factors contributed to successful implementation. In the most successful classrooms, the teachers appeared to have a pedagogical style that permitted them to incorporate the materials without radically changing their approach to teaching. Such a style usually was one that permitted a combination of teacher-centered and student-centered learning, with easy transitions between the two. Structuring the classroom environment for students to work in small groups proved to be a most advantageous way to implement the materials. Teachers circulated among groups, guiding activities and assisting the students and students often discussed the concepts among themselves to derive responses to questions in the tutorials. Teachers who had multiple ways to use computers and multiple types of hardware also appeared to have more success. For instance, teachers who used a combination of projected computer animations for whole-group guided discussion and stand-alone computers for small group

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

activities also reported success implementing the materials. Similarly, five to seven computers spread out to allow students to work in small groups or wireless connections where students could form their own workgroups dynamically seemed good ways to configure for student-centered activities.

Findings Related to Specific Learners

Some student findings had implications for teachers implementing such a technology-rich product. In particular, we saw some evidence that this approach might have had unanticipated effects on specific populations of learners. For instance, one teacher noted that the academic performance of her students with Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for learning disabilities improved while implementing the program. The most dramatic observation was a student whose mark improved from a D average to a B average. In an unfortunate confirmation of the learner's preference for the prototype approach, the student's mark slipped back to a D when the textbook-centered curriculum was reinstated at the end of the pilot test. In the same class, two English-as-a-second-language students' marks also improved while using the prototype materials. During study hall, they were able to access the Website and complete activities at their own pace. While novelty may play some role in these findings, it is worth noting that the implementation covered a period of one to three weeks per chapter.

In contrast, analysis of student journals indicated that low-proficiency readers had more difficulty reading text on a computer monitor than with a textbook. These learners also became disorientated with activities that launched more than one browser window. For instance, some of the Webquests required learners to navigate across Websites, opening several concurrent windows. As a result, such students appeared to have trouble staying focused and on task, jumping instead between and among Websites.

Recommendations

As a result of the first year's pilot test, we are able to make a few recommendations. These recommendations have already shaped our guidelines for the second year's filed test. They may well also apply to implementing other kinds of technology-rich science materials.

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

- Technology-rich products still demand more technological sophistication than many teachers currently possess and more technical support than many schools currently provide.

Cutting-edge really means early implementers give blood so that later users may have fewer problems. As we saw in our pilot, present levels of technology call for a lot of troubleshooting. Until things become simpler, teachers need to be adept troubleshooters if they wish to use technology-rich materials in their classrooms. Given the troubles that some of our teachers had with technical support in their buildings, administrations that wish to see their teachers use such materials may need to make certain that the necessary level of technical support –and responsiveness—is there for teachers. In addition, teachers need to be made aware of the sorts of teaching technologies that exist, from large monitor connections to data projectors, to SmartBoards and amplified speaker connections. Not only should schools help their teachers understand what these technologies are and how to use them in teaching, but materials produced for use in schools settings should include strong materials on how to use those materials in a wide range of delivery techniques.

- Teachers wishing to implement the materials will need to rely on a more diverse set of computer configurations than just using the computer lab.

Our teachers certainly encountered a number of problems in working with computer labs. Availability and scheduling problems made it difficult to complete activities where they fell in the curriculum. If teachers want to stay on schedule, they may need to think in terms of a combination of approaches, only some of which might occur in a computer lab. And, any activities in the computer lab need to be scheduled well in advance. Further, for technology-rich learning products to succeed, schools need to recognize the importance of instructional uses of computer labs, not simply use of such facilities for word processing and other activities calling for the use of tool/productivity programs. Similarly, schools need to think about Internet access for classrooms.

Technology continues to advance. Wireless computers certainly appeared to help those teachers who had them implement our prototypes in more flexible ways. Unfortunately, once a technology solution finds its way into a school, competition for that resource becomes greater. For instance, a teacher in our sample had received a grant

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

to purchase wireless laptop computers for her school's biology department. At the beginning of the school year she was the only teacher using the equipment. However, as more and more teachers began using her wireless laptop computers, she had more and more trouble scheduling them for her own use with our prototypes.

- Technology-rich materials may change the nature of teacher planning for instruction.

While our teachers did not achieve the anticipated saving in planning time, the way in which they used their planning time did change a bit. It may be that having such rich materials may mean that teachers spend their advance time planning which parts of the product to implement when; how to prepare students for their interactions with the materials; which things to cover in whole-class settings, which in small groups, and which individually; how to match materials and activities to one's individual teaching style and philosophy; and how to assess student learning after using the materials. Of course, another use of planning time will continue for the present to be setting up the technology and preparing the setting for its use.

- Professional development may need to focus more on helping teachers and administrators understand how best to implement learner-centered approaches.

Our findings suggest that many teachers (and perhaps administrators) may not have as broad an understanding of learner-centered approaches to teaching biology as they might. It is worth noting that high school science teachers are more likely to have a science degree rather than a science education or education degree and may not have received training in incorporating technology into instructional contexts (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Professional Development and Training, 1998). If such teachers are to employ more learner-centered approaches as recommended in the report above, then professional development focusing on acquiring a diverse repertoire of pedagogical approaches is highly desirable.

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

References

Bailey, Gerald D. (1997, Sept). What technology leaders need to know: The essential top 10 concepts for technology integration in the 21st century. *Learning and Leading with Technology*; VOL25(1).

Black, Elizabeth Dillon (1998) Staff development baseline needs assessment. analysis of a statewide survey of directors and full-time instructors. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED428176).

Bybee, R. 1993. An instructional model for science education. In *Developing Biological Literacy*. Colorado Springs, CO: Biological Sciences Curriculum Studies.

CEO Forum (1997). School technology and readiness report: from pillars to progress. *The CEO Forum on Education and Technology, Year One*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED416819)

Cummings, Christen A. (1998). Teacher attitudes and effective computer integration. Master's research paper, University of Virginia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED419512).

Dockstader, Jolene (1999, Jan) Teachers of the 21st century know the what, why, and how of technology integration. *T.H.E. Journal*; VOL26(6)

Ediger, Marlow (1997). Computer literacy in the public schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED412919).

Fine, Linda (1999). Improving the integration of technology into the sixth-grade curriculum in a middle school. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED437909).

Gunter, Glenda A., Gunter, Randolph E., & Wiens, Gregory A. (1998) Teaching pre-service teachers technology: an innovative approach. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED421112).

Hall, Grey, & Mantz, Chris (2000) Middle school technology integration study. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED444564).

Heck, Gary J. & Wallace, Barbara (1999). Preparing to implement learner outcomes in technology: best practices for Alberta school jurisdictions. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED429571).

Hoover, Sheila J. & Abhaya, P.S. (1995). Instructional design theory and scientific content for higher education. Proceedings of the 1995 Annual National Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT), (17th, Anaheim, CA, 1995).

Jacobsen, D. Michele. (1998). Adoption patterns of faculty who integrate computer technology for teaching and learning in higher education. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Ottawa (Ontario).

Johnson, Margaret (2000). New roles for educators Milken Family Foundation. Retrieved October 2, 2001. from http://www.mff.org/edtech/article.taf?_function=detail&Content_uid1=290

Lemke, Cheryl, & Coughlin, Edward (1998). Technology in American Schools: Seven Dimensions for Gauging Progress--A Policymakers Guide. [Online]. Milken Family Foundation. Retrieved October 2, 2001 from: http://www.mff.org/edtech/publication.taf?_function=detail&Content_uid1=16

Copyright 2002, Authors
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Educational Computing Conference, City, ST, Month Year.

Mann, Monica (1998). Technology in education. *PREL Briefing Paper*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED415853).

McDermott, Laurie & Murray, Julie (2000 A). Study on the effective use and integration of technology into the primary curriculum. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED445669).

National Center for Educational Statistics (1996). National assessment of educational progress (NAEP), 1996 science assessment. Table 2.2. Figure 5.2

National Center for Educational Statistics, 1999 Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualifications of Public School Teachers Digest of Education Statistics 1998. Table 434. Student use of computers, by level of instruction and selected characteristics: 1984 to 1997 United States Department of Education. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, Teacher Survey on Professional Development and Training, 1998 http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed376991.html

Norman, Kent L. (1997). Pushing the electronic limits: no paper, no pencils, no books Society for Computers in Psychology 27th annual meeting Philadelphia.

Rogers, Everett M. (1986). Communication technology: new media and society. New York: Free Press.

Sherman, Lee (1998). The promise of technology. Northwest Education, 3(3), 2-9.

Smith-Gratto, Karen & Fisher, Mercedes M. (1999). An aid to curriculum and computer integration: prototypes for teachers, *Computers* in the Schools. VOL15(2).

Schnackenberg, Heidi L.; Asuncion, Jennison; Rosler, Dean (1999). The education forum: A web-based resource for teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Houston, TX, February 10-14, 1999.

Solmon, Lewis (1999). Results from a study of 27 states' district technology coordinators Milken Exchange on Education Technology. Retrieved October 2, 2001 from http://www.mff.org/publications/publications.taf?page=277

Technical Horizons in Education Journal (2001). State of the states in educational technology survey, first annual. Retrieved October 2, 2001 from http://www.thejournal.com/magazine/stateofthestates/

Copyright 2002, Authors

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").